

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action of Feb 25, 2005, Applicant respectfully submits the arguments below.

5       **Claim 1** stands rejected as being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Prior Art under 35 USC 102(a). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The Examiner has pointed to a combination of prior art flex interconnection circuits 220 + 224 of Figures 1 and 2 as forming a flex interconnection circuit on an "inherent" substrate to provide the elements of the Claim. This cannot be done in physical fact with the admitted prior art, the actual substrates for 220 and 224 are  
10       separate, neither one of them includes the other, nor does either one of them contain all the elements of the Claim. When these components are bonded together, these substrates are still separated by a bonding region, which often contains solder. There is no one prior art substrate for a flex interconnection circuit containing all the elements of the Claim. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove this rejection of Claim 1.

15       **Claims 2 to 6** are dependent upon Claim 1. The Applicant finds the use of the single flex interconnection circuit is not disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art, whether taken individually or collectively. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection of these Claims, and place them in condition for allowance.

20       If there are further issues the Examiner wishes to discuss, please contact either Earle Jennings or Gregory Smith at (510) 742-7417.

25       Very respectfully submitted,



30       Gregory Scott Smith  
GSS Law Group  
3900 Newpark Mall Rd  
Third Floor, Suite 317  
Newark, CA 94560

Reg. No. 38,309  
Phone (510) 742-7417  
Fax (510) 742-7419